

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion NOV 7 1944

Volume IV, No. 18

October 30, 1944

\$1.50 per year, 10 cents per copy

The Legacy of Wendell Willkie

ON November 7th, tens of millions of Americans will record their preference for the man who will very largely determine the destiny of their nation through four of the most fateful years of its history. The great majority will cast their votes under persuasion of arguments ably advanced by one or another of the three contributors to this issue. But millions will go to the polls simply as dutiful citizens, without enthusiasm, without conviction that the outcome, whatever it may be, will greatly matter, and with an inarticulate resentment against a political system which offers them candidates whom they would not have chosen, party platforms for the most part patchworks of evasive or straddling generalities, and a campaign as barren of statesmanship adequate to the times as memory can recall. That this situation is not due solely to the low state of party leadership but also to the complexities of the American scene and the political irresponsibility of its citizenry merely heightens the gravity of the problem.

In this light, the passing of Wendell Willkie takes on added significance. To those who share the outlook of this paper, there can be no more disquieting reflection than the fact that the three men to whom Christian Americans had learned to look as trustworthy guides—Messrs. Wallace, Welles and Willkie—have been tried in the scales of party interest and found wanting. In each case, there were limitations of personality or ability. But they were rejected not on account of these but on the insistence of reactionary pressures at the party controls.

Of the many qualities which drew the admiration of multitudes to Mr. Willkie, three may well be meditated upon by his fellow-citizens at this election season—comprehension of issues, integrity of conviction, independence of action.

History will place Wendell Willkie upon the roll of the prophets. Like all true prophets, his voice struck the double note, of promise and of warning. He brought the consciousness of a whole nation into awareness of "One World." In his grasp of the deeper issues of the present and their threat to the days ahead—the scandal of racial discrimination, the deathknell of white domination, the warning to predatory capitalism, the portent of the new Russia—he was fundamentally right. As with most prophets,

his vision may have foreshortened the future. The changes he forecast, and the dire consequences if they be not welcomed and turned to constructive ends, may not come as quickly as he supposed. But come they will. They will weave the texture of tomorrow. Future generations may link his name with that of Woodrow Wilson whose convictions spoke, though with very different accents, through his voice, and lift them both above their contemporaries as seers of this century.

Those who cherish utter honesty of mind will revere Mr. Willkie's obdurate, almost perverse, loyalty to the *whole* truth as he saw it. Not once but habitually, he leaped to advocate lost but just causes, to defend obscure victims of injustice, to speak the unpopular truth at whatever cost to his own standing and influence. Here, likewise, he suffered a prophet's reward. More than any other, he awoke this nation to Britain's heroism; but, when to the glorious truth of British fortitude at home he added the bitter truth of British folly in the East, he was widely condemned in Great Britain. As much as any, he turned American hostility toward Russia into appreciation; but he was excoriated by Russian leaders because to the truth of their nation's achievements he added the truth of their rulers' tyranny over others. He made the vindication of "free enterprise" a consuming crusade; yet he was cast out by its managers when he warned of the fate awaiting them unless they faced their vices and brought forth fruits meet for repentance.

Lastly, to the American citizenry, he epitomized scorn of party shibboleths and transcendence of party loyalties. So long as the Democratic Party held true to the future, he enlisted every energy in its support. When he believed that a moribund Republicanism might be revived to take up the cause, he swung to that task. At the end, he stood above party, in a phrase of ugly sound and unsavory associations, a "mugwump." In a day when party lines have ceased to represent political realities and party control is firmly in the grip of petty men, he has left an example to that great body of Americans who also place loyalty to country above partisan traditions and petty rewards, and in whose hands rests the redemption of our political life.

H. P. V. D.

The Case for Roosevelt

EDWARD L. PARSONS

THE Christian votes. That we take for granted. How he shall vote in any given election is another matter. He knows that no candidate is fully adequate to the task, particularly at a time when momentous decisions must be made. He knows that no man is indispensable in the sense in which the phrase has been misused in this campaign. The purposes of God will be achieved in the end whoever is elected. But he will never forget that that stream can be deflected into back eddies, dammed, muddied, the purposes of God set at naught by the will of men, sometimes focused in the will of one man of power. While it is necessary, therefore, to weigh the faults and limitations of candidates, the essential factors in making a judgment in any election are positive and the question is really always the same: which candidate is likely to take us further along the road towards the world which the great mass of men, if they think at all, long to see—a world of security and freedom for themselves, that is, a world which we humbly hope may be a little nearer than the present to what God would have.

So much in general. Turn then to the present election! If one's mind is fixed on that kind of future, if one is concerned with the interest of the common man not only at home but over the whole earth, certainly to most liberals the answer to our question is clear. The reasons for the reelection of the President are obvious, cogent and indeed unanswerable. Here are some of them:

1. His war record. Both parties agree that the immediate task before us is victory in the war. Both parties agree that we have made a magnificent war effort. But such great achievements do not come without leadership. His political opponents to the contrary notwithstanding, the President has been for years far ahead of the American people (and the Republican leaders in Congress) in his understanding of the world situation. His famous quarantine speech is evidence. War-mongering, they told him, but it wasn't. Draft, Lend-Lease, the destroyer and naval base transactions—all along the line he led. Congress, not the President, was responsible if we were ill-equipped when Pearl Harbor at last woke America to what was happening in the world. The overall strategy, the coordination of our forces and of ours with the United Nations—these things don't just happen. The President has given the leadership. He has commanded. We are winning. But we still have months of fighting in Europe ahead of us—

perhaps years in Asia. The common talk about swapping horses in the middle of the stream gives little suggestion of the real issue. We don't if we have good sense dismiss a general who is winning. We don't ask that Nimitz or MacArthur, Eisenhower, King or Marshall be relieved. They are all winning. But who appointed them?

2. The war over, the most essential interest of the United States is the creation of a world such as the Atlantic Charter, the conferences at Moscow, Teheran and Cairo, the planning at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks forecast. Now there is apparently no reason to question Mr. Dewey's (or at any rate Mr. Dulles') honest desire for that sort of a world. The question is not of purpose but of power. Who can best represent America? Who knows the world best? Who has the prestige, the influence, the contacts which will make his word count? There is only one answer. With consistent tenacity of purpose, as anyone who follows the story of his foreign policy may see, the President has tried to further the "Good Neighbor" policy throughout the world. All honor to Mr. Hoover for his initiative in South America, but it is the President who has carried on. In the trade agreements, in the long negotiations with Japan, in the efforts to preserve peace in Europe, in some policies which liberals have disliked but which seem to work in the end, he has gone forward. In the Atlantic Charter, at Moscow and Teheran and Cairo, the objective of adequate international organization is clear.

But there is no one in America or in the world who knows better the difficulties in the achievement of this end, who has quicker sympathy with other peoples, who knows personally more of the responsible leaders of other nations—no one who in the eyes of the world embodies better the power and prestige of the United States. Are we at this critical moment to turn over these responsibilities to one who has had no experience in dealing with the appalling problems of a world in chaos and no contacts with its leaders?

3. While the war and the international questions are at the moment most pressing, back of them and fundamental are the questions of our own social order. Here again the record seems clear. The achievements of the New Deal are impressive enough and sound enough to tempt Mr. Dewey and the Republicans to take them all over! They are achievements for the common man. They are concerned with his well-being. One passes some of them in review: banking, social security, housing, conservation, agriculture, that greatest of public projects, the T. V. A., recognition of the rights of labor and

their adjustment. The last alone is enough to enlist support of the man who gave the inspiration and leadership. Of course there have been mistakes in administration. There always will be no matter which party is in power. But the main lines of welfare for the common man have been marked out. Nor does any intelligent man take the President's unfortunate remark about the New Deal as meaning more than that during the war, pressure must be in other directions. If one is looking forward, if one is a liberal and does believe that we must serve the rank and file of the people rather than the interests of the privileged classes, the choice in this election is obvious. We have clear evidence of Mr. Dewey's honest desire for honesty in government. We can trust him "to turn the rascals out." We have no evidence save a late campaign conversion to the New Deal that he has profound convictions concerning the social welfare of the masses, either our own or the underprivileged throughout the world.

4. And then one looks at the supporters and the background of the two candidates. With all its faults, its sins, its city bosses (what about the Philadelphia Republican machine!) and its southern reactionaries, the Democratic Party is as Mr. Wallace has said, the liberal party. It is pretty poor, but we have to work with what we have. The Republican is certainly not that "better" party. The Republican machine fought Theodore Roosevelt as it has Willkie. It fought Woodrow Wilson. It blocked our participation in the World Order. It led us into the fictitious prosperity of the Harding-Coolidge era, a period from which only the shrewd and the strong came out unscathed and not all of them. It has fought (after the first hysterical months of Roosevelt's administration) every step of that administration. Its chief backers have hated him. They have consistently accused him of starting class warfare because he believed in the common man. It is a heavy strain on the political imagination to believe that even as able a man as Mr. Dewey can successfully control the interests which for two generations have found the Republican Party their most useful tool.

Allow validity to much of the criticism of the President's policies and administration, recognize the undesirability in general of so long a term of office, in the end the matter sums up in one question. Are we at one of the most critical and pregnant moments in history to dismiss from the service of our nation a man who, committed to the cause of the underprivileged and to the building up of world unity, on the one hand carries with him to the task courage, insight and extraordinary capacity to achieve, and on the other embodies to the world as does no one else the spirit, the ideals, the policies and the power of America? To the forward-looking liberal, be he Christian or not, there seems to be but one answer.

The Case for Dewey

JOHN CROSBY BROWN

AS a Christian churchman I expect to vote for Mr. Dewey for three main reasons. The first is that Mr. Dewey believes in capitalism whereas Mr. Roosevelt has given no convincing evidence that he does. The second is that I believe that Mr. Dewey can unify the country both on foreign and domestic policy more successfully than Mr. Roosevelt. The third is that I consider Mr. Dewey a better administrator than Mr. Roosevelt. Let me discuss these points briefly in turn.

The capitalist system is, in my judgment, better adapted to the achievement of a Christian society in the United States than any other. This is because the focus of Christian interest is the free, responsible, independent individual. The Christian objective is to develop the maximum number of self-reliant human beings who recognize a moral obligation to make the most of their talents and abilities. Balancing this duty of self-development is the duty of service in the spirit "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." No one can serve others except through the intelligence, understanding, skill, imagination, courage and industry which he himself has developed. No one can give to others except from the wealth he himself has acquired.

Individual talents and capacities, however, must be directed toward promoting the general welfare. The acquisition and transmission of wealth and power by the individual needs to be curbed in a Christian society whenever the privilege of the individual is acquired at the expense of the freedom of opportunity of his fellow men. To achieve the proper balance between self development and service is the constant Christian problem both for the individual and for society.

In the economic field this balance can, I believe, be best achieved by concentrating on the following five objectives: (1) to provide incentives which will stimulate the individual skills, talents and capacities of the people to the full, and hence result in the greatest and most effective production of goods and services; (2) to provide steady employment for all who are able and willing to work; (3) to distribute recompense as nearly as possible proportionately to service rendered; (4) to provide security in involuntary unemployment, sickness and old age; (5) to provide protection against exploitation and sharp practice.

In his San Francisco speech on the future economic policy of the United States, Mr. Dewey showed that he is in favor of all the foregoing objectives, and that he has a clearcut, intelligent program for achieving them. Mr. Roosevelt and the New

Dealers have shown themselves to be in favor of objectives 2, 4 and 5. They have shown neither interest in nor understanding of objective number one, which is the keystone of the whole economic arch, and in my opinion, have shown a woeful inability to contribute to the achievement of objective number three.

Mr. Dewey at San Francisco recognized explicitly that the old days when business was ruled by the "law of fang and claw" are gone forever, and that government has certain inescapable obligations for directing the economic order in the general welfare. At the same time he emphasized with vigor, a clarity and a deep conviction such as Mr. Roosevelt has never shown, his belief that the basic dynamic force on which we must rely for the increase of production and the provision of jobs must be the private enterprise and initiative of millions of free American citizens under the spur of the profit motive. As a Christian I believe that better social results are achieved when individuals operate under the profit incentive and are then free to use the wealth they have acquired under the direction of their own conscience and their own sense of moral obligation, than when, through excessive taxation and government regulation, the profit incentive is stifled and everyone, in effect, is working for the government which then decides in its wisdom how the national wealth is to be expended.

There are many who say that the program of Mr. Dewey contains so many features of the New Deal that it is almost indistinguishable from the latter. There is, however, one basic and all-important difference. Mr. Dewey's program is one of friendliness toward all classes and elements of the American people. The New Deal's program has consistently been one of hostility toward one element of the population, namely, the business community. Whatever the motives of Mr. Roosevelt, the effect of his speeches and actions throughout the twelve years of his administration has been to arouse the American people to distrust and suspicion of American business leadership as such.

Now the management of any business enterprise, large or small, is as essential to its successful operation as the high command of our armed forces is to the success of their operations. Whether we like it or not, the job-creating possibilities of the future are dependent on the imagination, vision and skill of the managerial talent of the United States. This talent can never function as successfully and effectively as it should in an atmosphere of ill-will, suspicion and crippling regulations.

The leadership which is currently coming to the fore in American business—men like Eric Johnston, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Paul Hoffman, President of the Studebaker

Corporation and Chairman of the Committee on Economic Development, Louis Ruthenburg, President of Servel, Inc.—and many others of similar calibre, conceive of human relations as by far the most important part of the job of the modern executive. They know that there can be no successful industrial progress in this country unless management and labor work as a team with government, and unless individual men and working women achieve constantly more satisfactory conditions not only financially but in terms of pride in their work and understanding of how what they are doing contributes to the business as a whole. Men of this sort, in my judgment, will receive better understanding, more backing and more encouragement from Mr. Dewey than from Mr. Roosevelt.

In foreign relations the record of the Roosevelt Administration is splendid. There is no public figure for whom I have greater admiration and respect than for Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The general program of the administration for American cooperation in the establishment of a new League of Nations, insofar as it has been revealed, meets with my hearty approval. However, this program will stand or fall by the measure in which the Congress and people of the United States support it. Mr. Dewey has frankly and unconditionally announced his support of a society of nations empowered to use force to prevent aggression. He has taken the unprecedented and, in my judgment, extremely patriotic step of trying to take foreign policy out of the region of partisan discussion. The conferences between Secretary Hull and Mr. Dewey's representative, Mr. John Foster Dulles, are unique in American history and demonstrate the strong desire of Mr. Dewey that American participation in a collective security program will not founder this time on the rocks of partisan political opposition as it did twenty-five years ago.

Mr. Dewey, to be sure, is inexperienced in foreign affairs. But his chief adviser, Mr. John Foster Dulles, has probably as much experience in this field as any American citizen in or out of Congress. For years he has been the distinguished leader of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches. It is reputed that Mr. Dulles is Mr. Dewey's prospective choice for Secretary of State. Surely, if anyone is qualified to guide us in the direction of a Christian peace, it should be Mr. Dulles.

We now come to what seems to me the major reason for making a change at the present time. Mr. Roosevelt, whether through his own fault or not, has succeeded in antagonizing not only the Republican wing of Congress but large and influential elements of his own party. This antagonism is so deep-rooted that it is extremely doubtful if the Roosevelt

administration would be capable of securing essential Congressional support for joining a collective security system without crippling reservations, or for the many other difficult and sometimes unpopular measures in foreign policy which will be essential if lasting peace is to be won. It will do no good for Mr. Roosevelt to lead if Congress will not follow. Mr. Dewey, on the other hand, is a new figure who, if elected, will enter upon his task free from the burden of past feuds and antagonisms, and with a mandate from the people of both political parties to bring America into an effective international security organization.

Finally, the solution of the gigantic problems which will confront the next President calls for the highest order of administrative skill. Just as the best military strategy is useless without good tactics in the field, so the finest political program is nullified if poorly administered. Few will claim that efficiency as an administrator is Mr. Roosevelt's strong point. Mr. Dewey, on the other hand, has shown himself an excellent administrator.

For these three reasons: that Mr. Dewey's election will release the creative energies of American enterprise in the economic field so as to provide maximum employment at good wages; that Mr. Dewey is capable of uniting the nation back of a sound foreign policy, and that Mr. Dewey is qualified to bring order out of the present administrative chaos in Washington, I expect to vote for Mr. Dewey.

Authors in This Issue

Bishop Parsons has recently retired as Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of California. Mr. John Crosby Brown is President of Tamblyn and Brown, Inc. Dr. Phillips P. Elliott is Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, New York. Dr. Harold W. Dodds is President of Princeton University.

Christianity and Crisis is a cooperative enterprise which has behind it a Board of Sponsors who have been exceedingly loyal to it. On most questions the editors have exercised great freedom in expressing convictions but they do not believe that they have a right to commit this journal to a particular candidate in this election since there are such differences of opinion in regard to the election among the sponsors. We have therefore done the only thing that seemed possible in the circumstances by securing statements in favor of each of the three candidates for the Presidency. The articles in favor of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey are written by two of the most active sponsors of this journal. We have been glad to secure an able article in favor of Norman Thomas by Dr. Phillips P. Elliott.

The Case for Thomas

PHILLIPS P. ELLIOTT

THIS is the fifth time that Norman Thomas has been a candidate for the Presidency. He has also been a candidate for Congress, for the Governorship of New York state, and for the office of Mayor of New York City. To none of these has he been elected. The country has therefore been deprived of the services of a man who is acknowledged by both his supporters and his opponents to be one of the ablest, most thoughtful and most courageous figures in American public life.

The reason for these defeats lies of course in the fact that he has been a candidate of the Socialist Party. Had he run on the Republican or Democratic tickets, it is quite probable that now he would be in official life. The fact that he has adhered with such loyalty to the Socialist cause is an indication of the fidelity which he shows to principles, regardless of political expediency or advantage. It is this continuous and uncompromising allegiance to what he believes to be right which makes him the outstanding candidate for President today, and which commands the respect and the vote of many of us who are not members of the Socialist party and who do not follow all of its policies. Norman Thomas has for so long carried the banner of political and industrial democracy, of free speech and free action, of international and inter-racial brotherhood, that one who wants to cast his vote as directly and effectively as possible for these principles, feels drawn to his support with an irresistible appeal.

This does not mean that the other candidates and other parties do not stand for these high principles. Of course they believe in them, theoretically. The trouble is that one feels of the two old parties that they will do almost anything to snare any considerable number of votes. They must not antagonize the South, they must not alienate the industrial East, they must not injure the farmer's feelings or prospects. Strong adherence to principle does not come about by wondering just how this and that and the other special interest will be affected. The result is that the old line party platforms strike one as a jumble of generalizations, each one with an eye cocked on the group of votes marked for capture. This is good politics, no doubt, but it is not very satisfying to one who would like to vote for a platform and a person whose convictions are clear cut, and whose allegiance is to the general good.

Just now the important issue is the ending of the war and the developing of a post-war society which will be able to remain at peace. Mr. Dewey is making his appeal on the basis that the next administra-

tion will be largely a peacetime one, and that the weary leaders of wartime are not qualified to deal with these new problems. We all hope that he may be right in his estimate regarding the near end of the war. He has not, however, given any indication that he is any less tired than the President, or that he has any plans which are drastically different or better than those the present administration proposes. His appeal is simply to put new and younger blood into foreign policy which will be carried on rather largely as before. His one advance in the situation has been to warn against the attempt to control the world by a military coalition of the three or four strongest nations among the victors. But as one hears and reads his statements on international affairs one feels that he has no solution beyond that of some kind of league to "enforce peace," which means that when such an organization uses its highest powers, it produces not peace but war.

Norman Thomas throughout his career has challenged the assumption that force can ultimately determine progress. During the first World War he was a pacifist, and gave up his church because of the criticism directed against him on that score. He is not a pacifist in this war, but takes a position which those who believe in venturing much for peace will find satisfying. He is critical of the "unconditional surrender" slogan of the Allied Nations, and is being vindicated in that criticism by more conservative authorities, particularly in Britain. He continues to warn against the dangers of imperialism, and has been almost the only national figure raising the question as to whether the war in the Pacific is for the purpose of restoring to Britain and the Netherlands their former empires, or whether a new venture in freedom will result from this period of awful strife. He is outspoken in his criticism of any plan for peace-time conscription to the United States. No more cynical view of the post-war period could be taken than is represented by this move to bring the military system, which has had so much to do with producing the recurring wars of Europe, to our American shores. The danger of the militarization of American life is perhaps the greatest of our domestic problems, and to one who feels it to be so there is no alternative to voting for the man who so continually and forcefully opposes all such tendencies. I cannot see how one who cares about building realistically for peace can endorse the major parties or their candidates.

They think and talk always in war terms. The record of Mr. Roosevelt is quite clear. Having promised that he would not send boys away from these shores, within a few months they were sent. The Neutrality Act which had been passed for the very purpose of avoiding war, was repealed just when it was most appropriate and necessary. "Over-

age" but very usable destroyers were bartered to Britain, to one party in the conflict, while we were still neutral. Our warships were convoying materials for Britain long before Pearl Harbor. Gradually the whole sordid tale is coming out, and whether or not one feels that our entering this war was inevitable, all must agree that the present administration seemed to do nothing to keep us out, and many things which moved us in. Mr. Dewey has the chance of a lifetime to point out this vast and hypocritical betrayal. But does he? On the contrary, he endeavors to prove that the President was not sufficiently well prepared for the war, which he, like Roosevelt, felt was coming with the inevitability of a hurricane. On this issue, the President can win hands down. But with Thomas the issue is joined. He does not regard war as an act of nature, before which men are powerless. He knows wars to be the result of injustices and tensions, of imperial ambition and military pride. Against these he directs his words and his works, and the result is that whether people vote for him or not, they give to him the admiration which is always due a man who knows where he stands, and whose long and unselfish, and often sacrificial, labor for the public good have marked him as one of the truly great patriots of our time.

The Church in Action

A democracy, such as the United States, rarely pauses to consider how deeply its democratic ideal is rooted in the Christian religion. If you favor a free society rather than one of tyranny, you do so by an act of faith. The basic principles of the social sciences were not derived from the study of anthropology, sociology, psychology or economics. On the contrary, they are matters of faith which antedate the methods of these scholarly subjects; and they set the frame of reference for both science and citizenship. And they stem from the roots of the Christian faith.

The democratic ideal is the Christian ideal because it alone accepts Christ's emphasis on the infinite value of the individual. His message envisioned freedom in religious terms long before democracy took a political form, or science and technology appeared to help set man free.

Christians are responsible for what their governments do, as well as for what they themselves do, as individuals. One of the most annoying questions that a Christian can face is why is it that he fails so often to extend his moral code to his nation. Why does he permit, nay, often compel, his government to act toward other governments in a way that would outrage his conscience if the action were between individuals?

There are natural reasons why man so often appears at his worst when acting in or for a group; but for Christians the significant truth is that the moral code applies to groups and nations as well as to persons; that we are personally responsible for the behavior of our nation, as for our own private conduct. There is no national over-soul which sets its own morality, beneath which the Christian can hide and escape his accountability to history.

Nor can the Christian Church avoid responsibility as to how its members act as citizens. I am not suggesting that it drop religion to take up sociology and economics. Quite the contrary! Yet the Church cannot remain aloof from the moral aspects of

relevant issues which are stirring the world.

One of the handicaps to democracy, in a big society like ours, is the tendency of citizens to become spectators of government, rather than participants. Yet it is the moral duty of the Christians, as a Christian, to participate. Because democracy best expresses the Christian ideal, Church members are particularly charged with preserving and extending it. But the future of democracy at home (domestic democracy) is inseparably bound up with world order. The world cannot continue to have war and liberty both. The time has come to choose between them. For the Christian who practices his faith there can be but one choice.

HAROLD W. DODDS

The World Church: News and Notes

Desecration of the Bodies of Japanese Soldiers

It is now known that the episodes involving the desecration of the bodies of Japanese soldiers have been an extremely serious blow to the confidence which many Christians in Japan have had in the essential decency of Americans. They have been excellent material for the Japanese propagandists. The following statement by the Right Reverend Henry St. George Tucker, as President of The Federal Council of Churches, expresses the general attitude of Americans:

"The Christian thinking people of America cannot but deplore isolated acts of desecration with respect to the bodies of the soldier dead of those nations with which our Government is at war. It will be recalled that on August 10 the White House made known the fact that President Roosevelt had refused to accept a letter opener which was described as having been carved from a bone of a Japanese soldier. In addition, pictures have been shown displaying the skulls of Japanese soldiers sent to this country.

"However much actions of this kind may have been provoked by the military conduct of the Japanese, they cannot but be condemned not only from the standpoint of Christian ethics but also out of respect for the canons of human decency. Nor can we be unmindful of the fact that the reports of such conduct have the effect of stiffening morale in enemy countries and of engendering feelings of hatred that will make more difficult the establishment of friendly relations with the Japanese people once the war is over.

"Christians will, I am sure, warmly approve the action of the President in declining to be a party of this practice. It is our belief that as a group our men in the Army would deprecate it. As the President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America I call upon them to discourage it among the relatively small number of their comrades in arms who may be inclined toward such conduct. We are gratified to know that any such practice is contrary to the spirit and policy of our military leaders and would urge them to make the existing policy thoroughly effective."

Dealing with Germany

The Archbishop of York's plea for restraint in dealing with Germany, following a similar statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the effect that the time had passed for speaking of punishing Germany as a whole nation since the air-raids have already punished the German people, indicates that not even the months of robot bombs have distorted the judgment of British Christians. Opposing "wholesale and indiscriminate" vengeance on German people, the Archbishop of York declared that "on the other hand we have no right to forgive them lightheartedly" in his presidential address to the Convocation of York. The following resume of the Archbishop's address was reported by the New York Times, October 13, 1944:

"There must be punishment of those proved guilty of atrocities and to prevent Germany from plunging the world into another war she must be completely disarmed and deprived of all possibility of rearming in the future. At the same time the Archbishop said that a nation of 80,000,000 could not be permanently restrained by force and in our "positive and constructive policy" the Germans must be given hope. They must be made to see that we look forward to the time when the Germans will resume their contributions to the world in science, industry and art, he added.

"The murder factory near Lublin, the wholesale asphyxiation or machine-gunning of tens of thousands including children and women, the death trains, the wiping out of whole villages like Lidice and Oradour, with all their inhabitants, these are crimes that we have no right to pass over," the Archbishop said.

"For us to accept into full fellowship an offender who has committed wrongs against God and man, who still exults in his wickedness and proposes to repeat it when the occasion offers, would mean that we identified ourselves with his crimes. So far from Germany there has come no voice of penitence. There must be repentance before there is forgiveness, though the Christian must do his part to encourage and to welcome it."

"The reconversion of Germans must be undertaken by Germans themselves, said the Archbishop, declaring

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

it 'ludicrous' to think that the victors can send missionaries for the 'terribly hard task' of bringing about a change of heart on the part of the Germans."

Findings of World Council Collaborators

From the findings of the meeting of collaborators of the World Council of Churches, held at Presinge near Geneva, from July 7th to 9th, 1944, we quote the following especially significant points. From the findings on: *Evangelism in the Post-War World*:

"The world today is thirsting after true liberty and true justice, and the Church is consequently offered a unique opportunity for evangelism. If the Church wishes her words to be convincing, she must allow herself to be separated from specially 'bourgeois' associations. She must achieve freedom and repent. Only a Church which accepts the revolutionary Word of God in the social sphere will be able to speak to the dechristianized masses.

"The Church cannot content herself with inviting those outside to enter her community-life as it is today. On the contrary, she will have to go out to those who have lost contact with her, as she does to the heathen in missionary lands. Such an action on the part of the Church demands:

"(a) that she once more become aware of her missionary responsibility. As a result, each local fellowship must in itself be a centre of evangelism;

"(b) that she really take notice of the existence of 'classes' and natural communities, which are very different from one another by their manner of living, mentality, language, and culture: she must also take into account both the changing and the constant human factors; the Church must draw its inspiration in this sphere from the methods used by missions in heathen lands;

"(c) that she prepare teams of specialized evangelists (pastors and laymen) . . ."—I. C. P. I. S., Geneva.

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit 2, Mich. 650 1-45

The Quisling Government Attacks Foreign Missions

The Quisling Government has just taken new steps against the Church which have caused a great sensation. According to Swedish newspapers, the members of the Board of Directors of the Norwegian Missionary Society have been removed from their functions because of "illegal activity," and the President Kornelius has been sent to Lillehammer, where there are at present about twenty-five bishops and pastors in forced residence. The State Department for Church and Education has placed the administration in the hands of a Quisling bishop with plenary powers.

The Norwegian Society, which was able in 1942 to look back on a hundred years of existence, is the largest in the country and has branches in almost every place of any size. As contributions to missions have considerably increased in the past few years, and as at the same time the transfer of funds to the mission fields was not possible, the Missionary Society has at its disposal important sums which are earmarked for its work after the war.—I. C. P. I. S., Geneva.

Norwegian Church Protest

The Swedish paper, *Göteborgs Handelstidning*, published information stating that in all Norwegian churches recently a declaration was read, signed by all Church bodies in Norway, in which they protested against the Nazi treatment of the Norwegian Mission Organization.

Is France a Mission Land?

Two Roman Catholic priests, Fathers H. Godin and Y. Daniel have recently written a book, *Is France a Mission Land?* According to the review in *Le Christianisme au XX^e Siècle* "the authors have spent ten years in evangelistic work among the submerged masses of the Paris area. In their book, they distinguish three kinds of areas in France: Areas which are Christian in culture and outlook, where there is a relatively large number of practising Christians; areas where there is still a background of Christian influence but there are no practising Christians; and no longer any Christian tradition, or Christian morality, or even 'natural morality.' There, there is complete paganism, a spiritual vacuum—nothing but material civilization.

"Impressive figures reveal the extent of this pagan France. A priest was challenged to find twelve Christian workmen in the parish of 40,000 souls where he was curate, and he could not meet the challenge. Of 70,000 women doing 'voluntary' labour in Germany in 1943, the chaplain for civilian workers knows only thirty names, of whom ten are interested in the Catholic Youth Movement (JOC). Still more serious is the fact that in Paris, the number of young workmen who persevere after their religious instruction is one per cent up to twenty years of age, and falls to 1 in 200 or even in 300 between twenty and forty years of age. And these are people who have known some kind of Christian influence. How are the masses who no longer know anything of the Gospel to be reached? 'It must be said boldly,' conclude the authors, 'that in 1943 the faith is not being preached throughout a whole area; millions of people are no longer being evangelized in France.'"